

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 IN RE: MIDLAND CREDIT  
12 MANAGEMENT, INC.,  
13 TELEPHONE CONSUMER  
14 PROTECTION ACT LITIGATION  
15  
16  
17

Case No.: 11md2286-MMA-MDD  
Member Case No.: 15cv1712-MMA-  
MDD

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE PLAINTIFF ASHOK  
ARORA'S EX PARTE MOTION TO  
COMPEL**

**[ECF No. 737]**

18 Plaintiff Ashok Arora ("Arora") in member case number 15cv1712-  
19 MMA-MDD moved to compel Midland<sup>1</sup> to supplement certain discovery  
20 responses relating to Midland's dialing technologies and processes. (ECF No.  
21 737). On December 30, 2019, Midland filed an intent to respond to Arora's ex  
22 motion and indicated that the parties were working on a joint motion  
23 regarding the matter prior to Arora's *ex parte* filing. (ECF No. 739).  
24 Pursuant to this Court's Civil Chambers Rules, the parties were required to  
25 file a joint motion for determination of discovery dispute. Arora is aware of  
26

27  

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court refers to all Defendants in this case as "Midland."

1 this requirement because the parties were preparing a joint motion on the  
2 instant dispute and because the same parties have filed a joint motion on a  
3 different dispute. (See ECF Nos. 736, 739). Accordingly, the Court **DENIES**  
4 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE** Plaintiff Arora's *ex parte* motion due to  
5 noncompliance with this Court's joint motion procedure for discovery  
6 disputes. The parties may file a joint motion for determination of discovery  
7 dispute on Midland's dialing technologies and processes.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: January 6, 2020



Hon. Mitchell D. Dembin  
United States Magistrate Judge